



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

does not discuss at length, but he calls attention to the fact that whereas under the old system the minister had both to find out the ideas and to apply them, under the present arrangement he is more and more the mere exponent and enforcer of ideas furnished to him from without. Therefore the English Bismarcks and Cavours may do more effective work outside the cabinet than in it.

Exception may perhaps be taken to the statement on page 408 that "never, since the days of George I., has there been a quarrel between Parliament and the Crown, save for the few brief months at the beginning of 1784". In 1757 the country was for three months without a government because George II. was unwilling to accept the ministers whom Parliament finally succeeded in forcing upon him.

MARY TAYLOR BLAUVELT.

The Unreformed House of Commons: Parliamentary Representation before 1832. By EDWARD PORRITT, assisted by ANNIE G. PORRITT. Vol. I., England and Wales; Vol. II., Scotland and Ireland. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1903. Pp. xxi, 623; xiv, 584.)

THE title of these two large volumes, containing about half a million words, is too modest. The book is really an elaborate history of the representation of the Commons in the three kingdoms, including not merely the character of the various franchises, but the whole scheme of the relations between members of Parliament and their constituents. Constitutional histories dealing with the legal aspects of such questions we have in abundance; social and political histories are also sufficiently numerous, but nowhere else is there to be found in one work so full an account of the membership of the House of Commons, associated with adequate glimpses of social environment. On the constitutional side Mr. Porritt's work will take its place beside Stubbs and May, and on the social with Lecky in regard to England and Ireland, and with Burton in regard to Scotland. These volumes are only part of what he promises. He intends to complete the work with a history of Parliamentary reform from the time of Elizabeth to the Redistribution Bill of 1885.

Mr. Porritt is an Englishman who has carried on the chief portion of his studies in the United States and in Canada. He bears testimony to the adequacy of cisatlantic libraries for such studies, and by residence under different types of representative institutions he has cultivated a certain detachment of mind, which is however not yet complete. Stubbs boasted that no one could tell from his writings whether he was a Radical or a Tory. Mr. Porritt champions democracy. There is no evidence of profound learning in regard to the earlier history of representative institutions. His attention is fixed chiefly on the last three centuries, but in regard to these his work is very thorough, and, among other things, he appears to have gone through the whole of the eighty-odd volumes of the *House of Commons Journals*. In addition to the standard authorities

he has used a great many memoirs throwing light on the relations between a member and his patron on the one hand, or his constituents on the other. He acknowledges the constant assistance of his wife, "without whom indeed the work would not have been undertaken". Excellent maps showing the representation in each of the three kingdoms add to the value of the work.

Mr. Porritt deals first with Parliamentary representation in England and Wales. Nowhere else is there to be found so lucid an account of the county and borough franchises, and one is tempted to turn aside to note the many singular characteristics and anomalies of these franchises, but space does not permit. In 1696 an act was passed practically prohibiting changes in the English constituencies. In 1729 any doubts on the finality of this measure were removed through the action of the House of Lords, a body which really had little right to pronounce upon representation in the Commons, and from that time boroughs were looked upon as private property. Then to alter the representation of a borough was to interfere with the vested rights, for which the English system has always showed special solicitude. The voter as well as the borough-owner had vested rights. In a small borough to have a vote was to be set up for life, and Mr. Porritt notes that the approach of an election sometimes sufficed to bring a hesitating swain to the point, since "the bribes to freemen were often sufficiently large to pay for the furnishing of a house" (I. 79).

After discussing the basis of representation, Mr. Porritt enters elaborately into the relations between members and constituents. He traces out the gradual removal of the restrictions on the choice of members until at last in 1832 only Jews and atheists were excluded from the House of Commons. Not, however, till 1891 did a Scottish constituency elect a Roman Catholic. The successive steps by which men without means were excluded from the House furnish a long and interesting chapter. It is in this respect that England is still far from the democratic level of the United States or Canada, for though the property qualification has been abolished, candidates must still pay the official election expenses. This is even now a heavy burden and in times past it was enormous. The fee of a returning officer was sometimes as much as £200, and where, as happened occasionally, the poll was kept open for six weeks, the unhappy candidates paid all the expenses of a small army of officials for that prolonged period. The following interesting case is cited:

"An example of what unscrupulous opponents might do is forthcoming in an episode in the election for the city of Norwich in 1818, when Edward Harbord, afterwards Baron Suffield, was contesting Norwich against William Smith and R. H. Gurney. At the close of the first day's poll, Harbord was left so far behind Gurney that all hope of carrying his election was abandoned. "Under these circumstances", writes Harbord's biographer, "one of the leaders of the party announced to him, that it was still desirable to keep the poll open. Mr Harbord inquired on what grounds. 'It will put Mr Gurney to a charge of one thousand pounds', was the reply. Tears of indignation actually arose in

his eyes, and he exclaimed, 'Good God, sir! What can you have seen in my conduct to lead you to infer that I would consent to put an honourable adversary, or any adversary, to such an expense for the mere purpose of aggrrieving him?'" (I. 191).

Mr. Porritt gives a history of the exclusion of office-holders from the House, and in a discussion of the ties between electors and elected he shows how slowly was developed the custom of granting the Chiltern Hundreds as a matter of course, so that a member might at will retire from the House of Commons. But to this day no provision has been made by which a constituency can get rid of an unwelcome member. The interesting account of the relations between members and constituents brings out the point that the unreformed House of Commons of the eighteenth century was in fact keenly sensitive to public opinion, and a certain reproach attached to the members for rotten boroughs, who were commonly under rigorous orders from their patrons. The intervention of George III. in elections shows with what keenness he followed the fortunes of each seat. He used his personal influence even with his tradesmen at Windsor, and he is found writing about vacancies within an hour or two of their occurrence.

In the first half of the second volume we are in a totally different atmosphere, for we pass to Scotland, which owed little in its representative institutions to the influence of England. Here Mr. Porritt follows the same method, but the Scottish Parliament disappeared two hundred years ago, and its history is therefore shorter. It had some peculiarities. There were three estates—the nobles, the shire members, and the borough members—but they all sat in one chamber; they had not a speaker, but a president, and the elected members were called commissioners. We are reminded that small bodies may do better work than large ones when we see that the Scottish Parliament, though never really representative, enacted legislation in regard, for instance, to education and land tenure far in advance of anything done in England. But the Union proved a blight to such progress. Then the borough-mongers—of whom the chief was Pitt's friend Dundas—completely controlled the Scottish members. In all the counties there were, prior to 1832, less than three thousand voters, and in all the boroughs only about thirteen hundred. Dundas knew nearly every voter in Scotland, where the wild scenes of an English election were not repeated, for the voters, being of the superior class, expected to be called upon decorously by the candidate both before and after an election. To this day, the electors to a few publicly endowed posts in Scotland, such as some of the professorships in the universities, expect to be called upon by all the candidates.

Unlike the Scottish, Irish representative institutions were modeled upon those of England, and to them Mr. Porritt devotes more than half of his second volume. There is a very full history of the struggle for the extension of the franchise to Roman Catholics. Mr. Porritt comments upon the magnificence of the Irish Parliament House and upon the almost oriental pomp of the lord lieutenant, who went out to dinner

attended by a squadron of horse, and in a chariot surrounded by men with battle-axes. Though the Irish Parliament copied that of England, it developed differences. Its House of Peers was insignificant. Long before any comforts appeared at Westminster, the Irish Parliament was a luxurious club, and most of the members of the Commons lived permanently in Dublin and were readily at the call of the government. In contrast with the rigorous exclusion practised in England, the public were allowed in crowds to attend the debates in the Irish Commons. Mr. Porritt does not find much in favor of "Grattan's Parliament"; indeed he departs a little from the reserve of the historian to say that Ireland has little cause to regret the loss of a Parliament so defectively constituted as hers was. It is the only child of the Mother of Parliaments that has ceased to exist.

So extensive a work is unlikely to be free from small defects. There is a good deal of repetition, and Mr. Porritt in his desire to illustrate the past by the present makes some assumptions hardly justified. It is doubtful, for instance, whether personal bribery has wholly disappeared from English elections (I. 164); if the gossip of the House of Commons is credible, elections are still won by buying votes, and there is a paradoxical conviction that the electors in the cathedral cities are the most corrupt. It is hard also to justify the assertion (I. 278) that in 1893 a majority was secured in the House of Commons for Mr. Gladstone's Home-Rule Bill, only because it was certain that the Lords would reject the measure. Mr. Porritt is too doctrinaire. Because of the obvious defects of the unreformed system he condemns it without reserve, and yet through it statesmen like Peel and Gladstone gained admission to public life. Westminster with its slum district is not entirely a city of "magnificent streets" (I. 567). Blount (I. 501) should be Blunt, and Roland (I. 290) was not the name of Rowland Hill. Scotsmen do not like in written discourse the term Scotch for Scottish; and country-house is better than "country homes" when buildings are indicated (I. 472). But these are trifles. Though the style is without distinction, it is clear. There are separate indexes for England, Scotland, and Ireland, and copious lists of authorities.

GEORGE M. WRONG.

Charles James Fox: a Political Study. By J. L. LE B. HAMMOND.
(London: Methuen and Company; New York: James Pott and Company. 1903. Pp. xi, 370.)

It would seem a brave man who in the face of Trevelyan's *Early History of Charles James Fox* and his *American Revolution* ventured to challenge comparison with those fascinating books by another volume on the same subject. Yet, aside from the fact that even such brilliant work as that of Trevelyan might, in our opinion, still leave a field for a more impartial biography of Fox, there is another reason for the appearance of Mr. Hammond's book. Save in very small measure, he deals only with that part of the life of Fox which Trevelyan's books have not yet